

ER 8-5020

card

Honorable Frank Thompson, Jr.
House of Representatives
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Thompson:

ROUTING SLIP

TO: ☒ MR. TOLSON

TO: ☒ MR. BOARDMAN

TO: ☒ MR. BELMONT

TO: ☒ MR. CLEGG

TO: ☒ MR. GLAVIN

TO: ☒ MR. LADD

TO: ☒ MR. NICHOLS

TO: ☒ MR. ROSEN

TO: ☒ MR. TRACY

TO: ☒ MR. WATSON

TO: ☒ MR. WOOD

TO: ☒ MR. YERGEN

DATE: *2/1/57* REVIEWER:

STATT

This is in response to your request that I comment on the extension of your remarks in the Congressional Record for 20 July 1956, which I have read with interest.

I do not consider it within my province to comment on the overall problem to which House Joint Resolution 690 is addressed. There is an established procedure within the government for determining the location of federal buildings, which has been followed by this Agency. I would like to comment, however, on that portion of your remarks which deals with the decision to locate the new headquarters for the Central Intelligence Agency at Langley, Virginia, as I feel there has been a misunderstanding on a number of points, and I review the facts as they actually occurred.

The Congress first granted an authorization for the construction of this building in 1951, and it has been under intensive consideration for the last two years. Also in 1951 the Langley site, among others, was suggested by the Commissioner of Public Buildings as a site already owned by the Government on which we might possibly construct a building to meet our needs.

In November of 1954 the question of dispersal was discussed with the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization and other agencies within the Executive Branch. After consideration by all interested agencies, we were granted an exception to the dispersal standards on 31 December 1954.

In early 1954 we commenced informal discussions with the National Capital Planning Commission. We have examined and

considered every site suggested by the Commission. To aid us in our site selection we engaged Clarke & Rapuano, a firm of consultant engineers of outstanding reputation. After a thorough study of our requirements and of the available sites, they recommended that we locate at Langley. I accepted this recommendation and forwarded it to the National Capital Planning Commission for consideration. As you know, the law provides (40 U.S.C. 71d(b)):

... (It) shall be the duty of the Commission to make promptly a preliminary report and recommendations to the agency or agencies concerned. If, after having received and considered the report and recommendations of the Commission the agency does not concur, it shall advise the Commission with its reasons therefor, and the Commission shall submit a final report.

While the Commission did not approve the Langley site in its preliminary report, we made a second submission, as provided by law, and in its final report rendered on 2 March 1956 the Commission registered its approval. I would like to emphasize that any statement made to you that this Agency in any way attempted to influence the appointment of members of the Commission is completely without foundation. The Commission's action had been preceded by an affirmative 5-3 vote of the National Capital Regional Planning Council, key planning body for the metropolitan area, and by endorsement of the Langley site by the Fairfax County Planning Commission, the Boards of Fairfax and Arlington Counties and the Falls Church City Council.

Representative Joel T. Broyhill, from Virginia's Tenth District, conducted a poll of his constituents which showed 74% favorable to our locating at Langley, with a 78% affirmative vote by the residents of Dranesville Magisterial District, in which Langley is located. A private survey of directly affected property owners in the area immediately adjacent to the proposed site revealed that 85% of these property owners had no objection to the location of the Central Intelligence Agency at Langley.

I hope that the foregoing information will to some extent clarify the picture and dispel any doubts that certain opponents of the Langley site may have raised in your mind respecting local opposition, the views of planning and governmental bodies, or the

propriety of this Agency's conduct.

The Congress has now authorized and appropriated \$40,000,000 for the construction of our new building and \$2,500,000 for the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway to the Langley site. On the basis of this action, we are now proceeding with our work on a much needed building for our employees, who are presently scattered throughout thirty four different buildings, principally temporaries, in the Washington area.


Sincerely,

Allen W. Dulles
Director



IG:NSP:fm (27 July 56)

Distribution:

- Orig & 1 - Add
- 2 - Signer ✓
- 1 - DD/S
- 1 - OL/BPS
- 1 - OGC/ 
- 2 - Leg. Counsel

cc: Congressman Joel T. Broyhill

MEMORANDUM FOR: The Director

The attached letter has been approved in substance by Colonel White. Col. White feels that the material in the Congressman's remarks was obviously furnished by Roger Fisher & Company. Joel Broyhill agrees. Broyhill also feels that this should not give us any concern, because no one ever pays any attention to the "Extension of Remarks" apart from the Congressional Record anyway. I would propose to send a copy of this letter to Broyhill.

Congressman Thompson is a Democrat from New Jersey, and is a member of the Education and Labor, and House Administration Committees.



Norman S. Paul
Legislative Counsel

27 July 1956

A5728

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 20

Italy into Uruguay. The Uruguayan economy, these sources say, was unable to absorb any such amount. As a result, it was transferred into Mexico, and then into the United States.

ACTIVITIES HIDDEN

In each movement of the money, they said, the owners' identities were hidden by numbered bank accounts—and the transfers were by number only.

There is concern not only in the Senate but in other agencies of the Government and in some parts of the business world over the amount of capital within the United States whose ownership is hidden.

The Senate subcommittee already has pointed out the potential danger of a Communist infiltration into the United States financial world, using Russia's vast gold reserves to buy into companies having defense contracts.

NO EVIDENCE YET

As yet, the Senate investigators are reported to have found no evidence that such a penetration has begun.

The subcommittee's aim as outlined by a committee source is this:

1. To discover where the foreign-controlled money has been invested and who the true owners are.

2. To close any tax loopholes by which the foreign owners are paying a disproportionate share of the income taxes.

The Senate group's inquiries indicate that in some cases American citizens have been employed as directors in companies without being aware that the companies actually are controlled by foreign interests operating through a brokerage, bank, or fictitious name.

ENTITLED TO KNOW

A source close to the investigation said: "Perhaps the owners of this foreign capital have nothing to hide. But it seems to us that the American taxpayer and stockholder is entitled to know who these people are and who are the true owners of the stocks that have been bought."

Next Tuesday the Senate subcommittee will hear testimony from Defense Department witnesses. They will be questioned about their knowledge of "hidden" ownership of companies which have vital defense contracts.

REDS PLOT FINANCIAL GRIP ON UNITED STATES FIRMS

(By Victor Riesel)

NEW YORK.—Two American financial wizards linked by the Senate with Communist spy rings, have infiltrated Wall Street and today are working for big investment firms.

It is believed that their assignment is to spot vital production firms and direct Soviet efforts to buy them up and tie them into the Russians' espionage and sabotage network in the United States.

edge of even the most secret defense plant production know-how. Give an even half-brained intelligence headquarters such industrial knowledge and it will know where we are deploying our forces, where we are putting our heaviest concentration, where we are prepared to meet assault, where our bottlenecks are, and what unions to infiltrate so that slowdowns and sabotage can be ordered to hurt us.

Dr. Arthur Bloomfield, senior economist of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, pointed out that it was technically possible for hidden investors abroad to buy up our factories, but said he had no personal knowledge of any such coups.

WALL STREET SOVIETEERS

But there are Senators who have. Neither they, nor I, will name the two Sovieteers who work high on Wall Street today. I can't even give their initials here.

One has been linked by Government investigators to the notorious Victor Perlo spy ring.

The other, according to congressional records, set up the structure of Communist penetration of the Government by men identified as Communist underground agents.

But these two Red Wall Streeters are just a couple out of scores of others who are penetrating United States industry through a series of special survey, inventory, and industrial economic agencies which gather more vital statistics about the United States in 1 year than we get Soviet promises of good behavior in Moscow.

And for all this the Soviets can spend freely. It costs nothing but gold. And they've lots of that counterrevolutionary stuff.

State of President Eisenhower's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1956

MR. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, serious questions are being raised about the techniques being used to sell the American public the idea that the present incumbent of the White House is well and quite capable of carrying on the duties of the Presidency. The Republican promotion campaign may be convincing some, but not all are being fooled. Even some of the newspapers that have stanchly supported Mr. Eisenhower in the past are beginning to show evidence

strictly synthetic, for it is no great surprise. It was expected all along.

First, there were the assurances from doctors, surgeons, and medical pundits that the operation was a great success and the President was healthier than ever. Then the daily bulletins on the improvement of the President's general health, which, through constant reiteration, created an atmosphere of extreme confidence in the President's strength and endurance.

This is in no way an unprecedented technique. Something of the same approach to a health problem was utilized in the fourth-term campaign of President Roosevelt when he was paraded through the rain in New York and Brooklyn. Indeed, the fact that Roosevelt was increasingly confined to a wheelchair was consciously deemphasized during the last years of the Roosevelt administration.

It is important to point out, however, that the promotional technique is being used, and that the President's health is a real factor and a grave problem for the American people to consider. It cannot be brushed off on the basis of a promotional selling device.

The unvarnished fact is that President Eisenhower has survived a coronary attack, which curtailed his activity, and an ileitis operation, which further curtailed his activity, and that he is now convalescent. His fitness to run for a second term is something only he can judge. He seems to feel that he is capable and fit.

His fitness to serve for a second term is something that the American people have got to determine at the polls in November. And they are entitled to all the facts, which, to a degree, they have had. But the American people are also entitled to know that the manner in which all the facts have been presented is circumscribed by a promotional planning technique, which leaves considerable information in fine print, like the ingredients of a food package under food and drug law requirements.

The announcement from Gettysburg was no surprise. It would have been more surprising if he declined. His health is still a factor. And the state of any candidate's health, Democrat or Republican, is an important consideration.

What Is the Eisenhower Administration Trying To Do to the Seat-of-Government Concept Decried by Article I of the Constitution?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

1956

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5727

How yields this miracle of strife: that two times two is five?
It yields when great men greatly strive,
When compromise is kept alive—
'Tis then that justice thrives.

To Dr. JOE and Dr. SAM our glasses now we raise:
To each and both let us invoke unnumbered happy days—
That party strife may justice raise,
And sportsmanship grace all our ways!

The Radford Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Walter Lippmann, published in the Washington Post on July 19, entitled "The Radford Proposals." I believe it is the most discerning exposition concerning those proposals that I have read.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE RADFORD PROPOSALS

There are going on inside the Government two big arguments about military policy. The one has been brought into the open through the Symington subcommittee, prompted, it seems plain enough, by high but not the very highest officers of the Air Force. This argument is about whether the money asked for by the administration is enough to keep us ahead of the Soviet Union in the ultimate nuclear weapons. Out of this argument has come the action of Congress in voting \$900 million more for the Air Force than the President asked for.

The second argument, which was brought into the open in dispatches by Mr. Anthony Leviero, turn on proposals by Admiral Radford to reduce the Armed Forces by about 800,000 men during the coming 3 years. This would mean a smaller Army but one armed with more deadly modern weapons. The Radford doctrine would give up the idea of being prepared to fight large local wars, like the Korean, with conventional, that is to say without nuclear, weapons.

There is a connection between the two arguments. It is that the cost of maintaining both kinds of military power is prohibitive. It is not possible to have both a large conventional force and a large nuclear force.

with a conventional Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Without saying that it is theoretically impossible, it seems to me most unlikely that a war as big as the Korean war, which concerned the U. S. S. R. and the United States of America, could ever be fought again without the use of nuclear weapons. The chances would be very great that small atomic bombs would be followed by bigger bombs and these by still bigger ones. The chances of general war would be so great that a local war on the Korean scale would be an incalculable military risk. It is not absolutely certain but it is very probable that for the visible future wars of this type will be absorbed into the overall nuclear stalemate. This calculation should not prove to be an imprudent risk.

The assumption which lies at the root of the argument is that the alternative to general nuclear war is local conventional war. I wonder. It seems to me that the real alternative is first guerrilla warfare and second, political infiltration and maneuver. Against neither of these kinds of warfare are the conventional American military forces prepared to be effective.

What fighting there is in the world today is in Algeria and in Cyprus and in Palestine. Such guerrilla warfare can be an effective kind of warfare in a sense that it wins concessions. But it is not the kind of warfare for which American military power, nuclear or conventional, is prepared or even designed.

It follows, I believe, that if ever our vital interests are involved in an outbreak of local violence and disorder, for example in the Middle East, we shall not again do what we did in Korea. We shall not engage ourselves in a big land war on the other side of the world. We shall remember that we are a sea and an air power, and we shall tailor the shape of our intervention to the character of our military forces.

We are vulnerable in Germany, in Japan, in Vietnam, in Korea and in Formosa, not to military aggression but to political infiltration and maneuver. Red China is working to make a deal with the Chinese in Formosa, and who can be at all confident that they will not succeed, if not now behind Chiang's back then later on when Chiang goes? The same kind of thing is underway behind Dr. Syngman Rhee's back in South Korea and behind Diem's in South Vietnam. In Germany negotiations with the East are not very far off and once Dr. Adenauer retires, they are certain to take place.

The critics of the Radford thesis, who want to maintain conventional forces big enough to fight another Korean war, may fairly be asked at what place, where our interests are at stake, a war of the Korean type might break out. This is a fair question because a military establishment has to be designed for a war with a particular adversary. It cannot be designed for any kind of war anywhere with anybody. Our present force is designed for a particular kind of war.

tion of the growing practice in the United States of raiding established business enterprises, especially those engaged in national-defense work.

Under the resolution which I introduced, an investigation would have been instituted to determine the identity of the persons engaging in raiding practices and the sources of the money used by them and the effect of these activities on the defense production capacity of the United States and on the national economy.

Mr. Speaker, on that day in March of 1955 when I addressed this House, I urged that this resolution be adopted and I tried to point out the great danger which I thought confronted us at that time.

It is of great interest, therefore, that in today's issue of the New York Herald Tribune there appears a front-page article written by Mr. Don Whitehead, which tells of an investigation now under way by an appropriate committee of the Senate which is seeking to "unravel the mystery of what happened to untold billions of dollars of foreign capital which entered the United States during the last few years and then disappeared."

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the other body has taken up this important question, and my only regret is that this House did not adopt my resolution which was introduced more than 16 months ago, for I believe, Mr. Speaker, that a thorough investigation of this situation is long overdue.

Very recently Mr. Victor Riesel also published an article dealing with this same subject matter.

As a matter of interest to my colleagues, I attach the article by Mr. Don Whitehead and the article by Mr. Victor Riesel:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 20, 1956]

UNITED STATES FLOOD OF FOREIGN CAPITAL ON—SENATE GROUP PROBES MYSTERY (By Don Whitehead)

WASHINGTON, July 19.—Senate investigations are seeking today to unravel the mystery of what happened to untold billions of dollars of foreign capital which entered the United States during the last few years and then disappeared.

Preliminary inquiries have developed the strong suspicion that the untraced funds have been used to an increasing degree to buy "hidden" control of some American companies and to gain at least a voice in the management of others which have important contracts.

1956

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5729

effect of this trend, if allowed to continue, could be to turn Washington into a ghost city.

Washington has been aptly characterized in a recent magazine article as "the pride of every good American and in reality the capital of the free world." It is your city and mine. To most of us in this Congress, its stately buildings and leafy avenues symbolize a second home.

To millions of tourists its gleaming monuments are reminders of our Nation's glorious past. To visitors from other parts of the world, Washington stands as a constant symbol of liberty and freedom—and of hope that these priceless attributes may someday be attained by the enslaved millions of the world.

Yet today, the security of this, the world's most important Capital City, is threatened by an indiscriminate flight of Federal agencies to the suburbs. Although this threat is less dramatic than that posed by the H-bomb and intercontinental ballistic missile, it can, if allowed to continue, have the same effect over the long term.

You can find the problem outlined in headlines of the day: "City of Washington in Trouble," U. S. News & World Report, July 6, 1956; "United States Agencies Join Rush to Suburbs," New York Times, July 15, 1956; "Undermining the Capital," Washington Star, June 12, 1956; "Agencies Scored for Leaving District of Columbia," Washington Post and Times Herald.

I shall quote briefly from some of these news stories and editorials. On July 15, a New York Times story bearing a Washington dateline announced:

The largest Federal construction program in years is underway with proposed and approved projects involving more than \$400 million in the Washington area alone. And, like many citizens of this town, more of the Federal agencies are turning to the suburbs for their new homes. * * *

All this, agency officials will explain, is because it is Government policy to disperse for defense reasons, there are few suitable sites left in Washington, and the modern buildings they want to build would run into trouble with the Fine Arts Commission.

But there is suspicion among some Members of Congress that agency officials, who generally have had free rein in selecting their sites, simply want "hunt country" to work in with plenty of free parking space and plenty of lawn.

The trend is causing some concern. Home-owners in the countryside are complaining. Businessmen in the city are protesting that the trend could be disastrous to Washington's economy.

A similar concern was voiced by the Washington Star in its lead editorial on June 12:

The public generally (has) cause to be concerned over what seems to be happening to the original concept of Washington as the Nation's seat of Government. That time-honored concept is seriously threatened by a movement in some Government circles toward abandoning the District as a site of Federal activities in favor of decentralized locations in the suburbs and beyond.

Equally disturbing is the apparent lack of a national policy governing so-called relocation. Heads of agencies have been given free rein, as a rule, in choosing sites for their new homes. It is all very haphazard, with planning agencies often assigned to subordinate roles.

And in its lead editorial for June 14, the Washington Post and Times Herald scored the "current confused relocation policy" which bases final decision for moving Federal agencies out of Washington on "the whims and preferences of individual agency heads."

REASONS FOR CONCERN

There is ample reason for this growing concern. The city of Washington, with its thousands of white-collar workers, small-home owners and small-business men, depends upon governmental activities for its very existence. Federal Government in this area accounts for nearly half of all employment. It also sustains a host of small businesses which exist to service Federal workers.

Directly or indirectly, Government accounts for the bulk of Washington's retail sales, rental payments and other basic activities. We already see a spiraling budget and falling revenues in the city—both largely caused by a population movement to the suburbs. We see Congress forced to refuse desperate requests from the District Commissioners for increased funds. Take away the operations of the Federal Government and Congress share of maintaining our capital city would increase to truly astronomical proportions.

These budget requests point up the disturbing fact that Washington is already in trouble. As the U. S. News & World Report put it in the magazine's lead article on July 6:

The visitor, captivated by the Capitol's lovely panorama and awed by the power that emanates from its portals, does not see the layers of troubles—governmental, social, financial—that are piling up to overburden the Nation's first city.

Yet these difficulties exist. In large part they are similar to the socioeconomic headaches suffered by other major cities. They include the familiar flight to the suburbs on the part of city families, the dwindling tax base, the traffic congestion, the rapidly mounting financial burdens and so on.

Today, gentlemen, I could take you only four blocks from where we sit in this Chamber and show you some of the worst slums in the Nation—houses without running water, and whose residents are forced to use outdoor toilets.

All of these problems are magnified by Washington's lack of any vote or true government of its own. They would be far worse were it not for the bolstering effect upon the local economy exerted by operations of the Federal Government.

It is against this background that a growing number of agency heads are deciding to relocate their departments outside the District. At least six major agencies are presently hoping to move. They include:

The Central Intelligence Agency, which plans to build a \$56 million building near Langley, Va.

The Atomic Energy Commission, which has started work on its new \$10 million headquarters near Germantown, Md.

The National Bureau of Standards, which is planning a \$40 million home near Gaithersburg, Md.

The Weather Bureau and the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which are planning a joint \$31 million building near Gaithersburg, Md.

The Geological Survey, which would like to construct another building, costing \$23 million somewhere on the Potomac River in Maryland.

Still other agency officials are considering the possibilities of relocation. For example, there has reportedly been serious talk within the Navy Department about moving to the Midwest.

How this will affect the Nation's Capital in loss of population is summarized in the New York Times article from which I quoted previously:

One estimate is that if all the proposals for the Federal agency exodus were adopted, some 50,000 residents of Washington would move out. Washington over recent years has lost a number of Federal employees to outlying areas, what with the Pentagon in Virginia and the National Institutes of Health and the Census Bureau in Maryland.

Now, on the basis of the best estimates available, it takes at least one person to service each governmental employee in Washington. Add to this the fact that, according to Census officials, the average Federal worker represents a family of three. This means that, for each Federal employee affected by relocation, at least four other individuals would be indirectly affected. And if 50,000 employees moved out of Washington, as the New York Times estimates they would, 200,000 people—or nearly one-third of the total population—would feel the consequences.

The President of the American Baptist Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Dr. Harry L. Dillin, the distinguished president of Linfield College, in McMinnville, Oreg., was recently honored by his election in Seattle as president of the American Baptist Convention.

Dr. Dillin, the second westerner to be honored by the American Baptist Convention as its president in 50 years came west to Oregon 25 years ago, and was named president of Linfield College in 1943 when he was 36, the youngest college president in the United States.

Linfield College, under the dynamic leadership of Dr. Dillin, has grown rapidly in size and prestige. Dr. Dillin has been noted for his civic work as well as his role as a college president, and has also served for two years as president of the Oregon Baptist Convention.

Also honored at the recent Seattle convention was Earl White, a Portland attorney and member of the First Baptist Church, who was named a commissioner of the American Baptist Convention.

A5730

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 20

Mr. President, Dr. Dillin is the second Oregonian within a year to be named head of his church. Dr. Paul S. Wright, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Portland, was elected moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent biographical sketch of Dr. Harry L. Dillin by William Hilliard, religious editor, from the Oregonian of July 15, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW BAPTIST LEADER GAINS RENOWN IN
BUSINESS, EDUCATION

(By William Hilliard)

A little man eminently capable of doing a big job—that's Dr. Harry Leslie Dillin, dynamic president of Linfield College and new head of the American Baptist convention.

The 48-year-old college president was elected president of the large Baptist body 3 weeks ago at the convention's annual session in Seattle. He will be president for 1 year.

Dr. Dillin, an active Baptist since childhood, is only the second westerner to gain the presidency in the 50-year history of the convention.

Oddly enough, the only other westerner was elected at the only other meeting in the Pacific Northwest. Corwin Shank was named head of the convention in 1924 in Seattle.

Dr. Dillin, who stands 5 feet 7½ inches tall is one of the youngest men to be named president of the convention and only the second college president to head the group.

Born in the east, he came West 25 years ago to teach math and economics at Linfield for 1 year and to "see the cowboys and Indians." After a summer vacation in the East, he wired the college to see if his job was still open, found it was and has been at Linfield since.

Dr. Dillin was graduated from Columbia University, New York, cum laude in 1928. He followed this with graduate work at the University of North Carolina, where he had been accepted for a teaching fellowship. He also has done individual research work at the Universities of London and Michigan.

He received an honorary doctor of law degree from University of Redlands, Redlands, Calif., in 1944 in recognition of his outstanding and meritorious service in the field of Christian education.

His rise to the presidency of Linfield was comparatively swift. He was appointed professor of economics in 1936 and 2 years later he was made controller of the college. In 1941 he was made controller-business manager.

SUCCESS COMES EARLY

When named president of the school in 1943, Dr. Dillin as only 38 and was declared by the trustees who elected him to be the youngest college president in the United States. At the time he was named president he was professor of mathematics and economics, business manager-controller and investment analyst.

In addition to his teaching duties he was tennis and golf coach. His court teams won more than 100 collegiate matches and for a number of years he held the course record for 9 holes at Riverwood golf course, disrupting part with a sizzling 31—5 strokes under par. Dr. Dilling recalls his coaching days as "the great joys of my years."

Still athletically inclined but unable to find the time for golf and slowed down too much for tennis, Dr. Dillin has taken up water skiing and spends his spare time at the family's cottage at Devil's Lake practicing his new-found sport love.

COLLEGE GROWS RAPIDLY

Under Dr. Dillin's leadership, Linfield College has grown tremendously. He has taken part in the building or renovation of all but one of Linfield's 19 buildings. Two dormitories are under construction and will be ready for occupancy this fall. The school supervises all of its construction work, including awarding of contracts and buying of all materials.

When the American Baptist Convention elected Dr. Dillin, it reached out for a man well trained in leadership. He is a member of numerous organizations and has inevitably assumed the leadership of almost every one of them.

He is a member of Phi Beta Kappa, Pi Gamma Mu and an associate member of Sigma Psi.

In McMinnville he is a member of the chamber of commerce and a past president of the Rotary club. He was district No. 154 governor of Rotary International in 1953. He is a deacon of First Baptist Church in McMinnville and has served on the board of trustees.

COLLEGE POSTS HELD

In addition, Dr. Dillin has served as president of the Association of Independent Colleges of Oregon and chairman of the Foundation of Oregon Colleges and the Pacific Northwest Athletic Conference. He also serves on two commissions of the American Association of Colleges and is chairman of the board of directors of the newly created Linfield Research Institute.

Working with the American Baptist Convention will be nothing new to him. He served as president of the Oregon Baptist Convention for 2 years and was elected last year to a term on the general council of the American Baptist Convention.

First hint of any move to nominate him for president was heard by Dr. Dillin in 1955 at the convention's meeting in Atlantic City. Dr. Dillin addressed the convention on education. Following his speech, he was approached by some delegates who thought he should consider the president's post. Dr. Dillin didn't take them seriously then.

This year is a year of reorganization in the convention and Dr. Dillin thinks this move was instrumental in his promotion for the presidency.

EDUCATION TO BE STRESSED

"I think the people who promoted me were looking for men with a background in business and organization," Dillin surmised. "And, too, I believe the convention wanted to highlight education as a means of stimulating interest among church people to strengthen colleges."

Dr. Dillin said the American Baptist convention is constructed loosely of a central organization "very disorganized." Much emphasis is given individual interpretation of the scriptures and local autonomy, he said.

Under Dr. Dillin, the convention will seek to unify. At the Seattle meeting the first step in this direction was taken when the general council was upped from 36 to 42 members and the council was augmented with the creation of a coordinating staff, equally divided with laymen and clergymen.

In line with the reorganization program, it will be Dr. Dillin's duty to name nine people as commissioners to reevaluate and to study the work of reorganization in the convention and to report to the national body at the 1957 meeting in Philadelphia. The commissioners will make their final report at the annual meeting in 1958 and at that time recommend further steps to be taken in the reorganization program.

One of the commissioners will be Earl White, a Portland attorney and member of First Baptist church (White temple).

The "go go go" president of Linfield—or "fireball" as he is sometimes called by his

students—has a full year ahead of him as president of the convention.

As chief officer, he will preside at all meetings of the convention and of the general council and will exercise general supervision over the affairs of the convention, a body representing a membership of 1,500,000 in approximately 6,500 churches in 34 States and the District of Columbia.

He takes off Sunday for meetings in Chicago and Greenlake, Wis., on the first round of activity that will keep him constantly on the go for a year.

At home will remain his wife, Irene, and two children, Harry Leslie, Jr., 14, and Kathleen, 12. A third child, John, 20, is a sophomore at Trinity University in San Antonio, Tex.

Dr. Dillin is the second Oregon man within a year to be named head of his denomination. In 1955 Dr. Paul S. Wright, pastor of First Presbyterian church, was elected moderator of the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.

Lawrence F. Whittemore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, one of the outstanding citizens of New Hampshire whose fame and influence extends far beyond the limits of our State is Lawrence F. Whittemore.

Mr. Whittemore is a former president of the New York, New Haven, & Hartford Railroad; former president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston; and former president, and now chairman of the board, of the Brown Co., at Berlin, N. H. The directorates upon which he serves and his business connections are far too many to enumerate here. He has long been a leader in the civic, educational, and political life of our State and of New England.

An interesting and inspiring bit of biography appears under the caption "Turning Points," in Dun's Review for July 1956. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TURNING POINTS

What makes a man successful? The question has always defied glib answers and is most profitably explored on an individual basis. In most men's experience major decisions translated into action have proved to be at least turning points. Mr. Warren Vlerow has asked several major business leaders to relate the personal decisions that did the most to place them on the path toward success.

Here is one of the answers:

L. F. Whittemore: "After returning from World War I in 1919, I found an opportunity to work for the New Hampshire State Tax Commission as an accountant. In 1922 the chairman of that commission put me in charge of an estate carrying on an active lumber business doing about a million dollars a year. I was at that time 28 years old and, while I had worked in the woods,

A winsome lass from Iowa and an oriental beauty from Japan forgetting Pearl Harbor as they help each other to register.

A contestant from Africa and a competing beauty from Australia forgetting the isolation of different continents as they try to figure out American slang.

A shinto from Japan, a Buddhist from Ceylon, a Christian from South America, a Moslem from Turkey, a Jew from Israel and a Taoist from Hong Kong forgetting religious differences as they exchange hints on how to parade before the judges.

And a gal from Brooklyn and a miss from Texas forgetting mileage distances as they kid each other about their accents.

All of these things add up to make the Miss Universe Court of Beauty a virtual United Nations in itself, leading to more complete understandings of the countries which sent the girls.

While the public whistles and claps and the girls develop friendships to return to their homes, the universe spectacle takes on another importance in the field of human relationships.

It is the appreciation of womanhood itself.

Particularly in the Orient, and to a considerable degree in Europe, women have traditionally been accorded a secondary place in society.

In the Far East, custom in many places has it that women must walk behind their men in public places and cannot own property. In Europe, women have been taught that their mission in life can be little more than home and children.

But, thanks in a large degree to the Miss Universe Pageant, new advantages, acclaim and appreciation of beauty is coming for womanhood.

Japan, where even the most attractive and brilliant girls traditionally were accorded second place in the family, has entered a contestant since the pageant started.

Its attractive entries have been hailed in America and in Japan have won new respect for womanhood as a means of national respect.

India entered a beauty in the first Miss "U" contest, but national religious feeling prevented subsequent entries. However, the controversy stirred up discussions relating to improvements of the rights of women.

Similarly, Ceylon has been noted for its attractive contestants but is not entering this year because of Buddhist religious injunctions. Former entries brought new acclaim for women in Ceylon; the injunction caused serious discussion of women's rights.

In Iceland, tradition has acclaimed women on their intellectual ability. The Miss "U" pageant has stirred thoughts of their physical beauty and this year the nation is sending a contestant.

The pageant has rightfully focused male eyes on milady and knowing men are recognizing that women, as well as being things of beauty, can perform important tasks in the field of science and industry.

Atom Liner Sought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following newspaper item:

ATOM LINER SOUGHT

TOKYO, July 18.—Japan's big OSK (Osaka Shosen Kaisha) steamship line hopes to have a streamlined, atom-powered liner on its South American run by 1961—if it gets enriched uranium from the United States. OSK said the ship could cruise at 25 knots and carry 1,700 emigrants to South America three times a year.

The Thoughtless Whims of a Few Eisenhower Appointees Threaten To Ruin and Bankrupt Hundreds of Small-Business Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to discover what the exodus from Washington to its surrounding suburbs will mean to the Nation's Capital in terms of lost purchasing power and taxes.

I have introduced a measure, House Joint Resolution 690, to preserve the economic basis of the Nation's Capital by establishing a basic policy and an orderly procedure for the location of new Federal buildings in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia. The text of this resolution is included at the conclusion of my remarks.

I am concerned with the consequences of this thoughtless, unplanned exodus to thousands of human beings—to small-home owners forced to put their homes on the block and relocate their families—to hundreds of small-business men faced with bankruptcy due to the loss of customers—to thousands of white-collar workers who, unwilling or financially unable to relocate at the whim of agency heads appointed by the President, would be forced to give up jobs and would, perhaps, become a drain on the local economy—and to churches, whose parishioners would have to reestablish their religious ties in other communities.

You would expect that, with much of the fate and future of our Nation's Capital hanging in the balance, relocation of Federal agencies would be subject to a logical procedure of careful investigation and factfinding, stressing the interests of Government as a whole and the cumulative effect of such moves on the Capital city.

You would expect that, before an agency head were permitted to move his department and his thousands of employees, he would have to present irrefutable planning, engineering, and economic facts to justify his decision.

You would also expect that some democratic system of checks and balances would exist in the relocation procedure, to prevent the possible circumvention by agency heads, either deliberately or unintentionally, of any of the required steps for obtaining officials approval of his decision to relocate.

Fantastic as it may seem, none of this is true today. As the previously quoted editorials indicate, Federal agency relocation is currently being decided largely on the basis of two factors—politics and personal whim—with defense usually quoted as the ostensible reason.

Now we all agree that civil defense should have overriding consideration. But the plain fact is that in these days of the H-bomb and guided missile, much of our defense thinking is as out of date as the model T. Bear in mind that the possible immediate fallout from an H-bomb covers more than 200 miles, and that varying amounts of demolition are caused up to a radius of 20 miles. I ask you gentlemen, how much protection can be afforded an agency by moving it across the Potomac and within a few miles of the city? It seems to me that our whole defense policy needs clarification, and perhaps revision, in the light of new developments in atomic weapons.

When, for defense or other reasons, an agency head decides he would like to move his department out of the Capital, certain types of clearances are theoretically required. In securing approval to relocate, agency officials are supposed to contact the following authorities:

Bureau of the Budget and Congress, on requested appropriations; General Services Administration, on planning of buildings and, occasionally, of the site; National Capital Planning Commission—and, if the proposed move involves the metropolitan area, National Capital Regional Planning Council—on planning aspects of the proposed relocation; and Office of Defense Mobilization, on civil defense phases.

PRESENT CLEARANCES INEFFECTIVE

But the sad fact is that these required clearances are often ineffective. Many agency officials are apparently unaware that they even exist. Frequently, agencies desiring to relocate omit steps in the pattern or do not follow them in logical order.

The city's two planning agencies—National Capital Planning Commission and National Capital Regional Planning Council—lack enforcement authority. Therefore, they are all too frequently regarded as merely a rubber-stamp routine.

considerable degree in Europe, women have
There is a serious deficiency in the manner in which Federal agency relocations are being processed—

Writes Max Wehrly, chairman of the National Capital Regional Planning Council.

Steps requiring coordination through, and reports of the planning agencies are being circumvented until administrative commitments have been made, thus presenting them with what is in fact a "fait accompli."

Furthermore, the entire pattern for relocation has never been pinned down and defined in any one law.

The result of the present haphazard method of relocating Federal agencies is, to a large extent, to leave the final decision for moving up to each individual agency head. And the inevitable consequence of this, is that Federal dispersal has become a political football.

1956

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A574

But what did happen? Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, and one of the Negro leaders of the country, offered his amendment anyhow. It presented an issue which Republican Congressmen from districts where there are many Negro voters couldn't dodge. No amount of persuasion from Eisenhower could keep them from voting for the Powell amendment.

As for southern Congressmen, they abstained from voting so as to make sure the Powell amendment supporters would have a majority. They wanted the final measure to be unpalatable on every side.

But there are northern Republicans—about 65 of them—who don't believe in Federal control of education and they too, voted for the Powell amendment because they knew it would help kill the bill. On final passage, they joined with the southern Democrats to make a majority against the entire bill.

Also important was the action of northern Democrats who helped to defeat amendments, proposed by Republicans, allocating the funds on the basis of the needs of the States. This principle previously had been indorsed, but the Democrats repudiated it. The final bill, therefore, was unsatisfactory to northern Republicans who favored Federal aid and southern Democrats who didn't, and thus was readily defeated.

It is a bit bewildering to see some of the so-called liberals ignoring what the southern Democrats did in helping the Powell amendment to pass or what the northern Democrats did in defeating the Republican amendments. And yet the defeat of the bill is characterized as a case of bad Executive leadership.

The truth is there are 4 parties in Congress today. There hasn't been a 2-party system for 2 decades, and recent decisions of the Supreme Court curtailing States rights mean that the 4-party bloc system will remain for many more years to come.

A significant aftermath of the school bill controversy is the discovery by southern Democrats of how near they came to being tricked by the argument that, if the measure were passed without the Powell amendment, they should have no objection to it. For the fact is that Federal funds could be withheld even without the Powell amendment or its counterpart. The administration has a legal opinion from the Department of Justice which is being used every day by the President's interracial commission. It claims the right of the Federal Government at any time to cancel any contract with any agency, public or private, which permits discrimination in employment on the basis of "race or creed or color or national origin."

The text of this important opinion has never been disclosed though presumably the public has a right to know the exact contents of such an important document that supports an executive order.

It's the knowledge that a threat exists to use Federal authority—even in the absence of a Powell amendment—to withhold funds from schools in the South which may prevent any school bill from ever being passed. It may lead to a demand for a specific stipulation in the law declaring that nothing in this or in any other law gives the Federal Government the right to withhold funds except for the reasons given in the measure itself.

What is surprising about the whole controversy is the assumption made by the "liberals" that those who voted for the Powell amendment should be reprimanded by President Eisenhower for voting their convictions. They are being upbraided for expressing themselves conscientiously. Because they are mostly Republicans, Eisenhower is being held responsible for their votes.

One wonders who is responsible for what the southern Democrats did and for the votes of those Democrats who don't want

Federal interference in schools on any score. The theory that the Presidency is a sort of benevolent dictatorship and that the Congress must become a "rubber stamp" has lately become popular doctrine with many of the so-called liberals.

The Civil Rights Bill Confusion Founded Attack on States Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star of July 18 had a pertinent editorial entitled "Alice Outdone." This editorial points out that the civil rights bill is before the House because of political pressure. It suggests that the bill might pass the House but will not pass the Senate and the editorial goes on to say "It is a good thing, in our judgment, that it will not."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including the editorial in question:

ALICE OUTDONE

The expectation is that the House, with both Republicans and northern Democrats reacting in the usual way to political pressure, will pass the civil-rights bill. There is an equally strong expectation that it will not pass the Senate.

It is a good thing, in our judgment, that it will not. For anyone who takes the trouble to read the record of the House debate cannot fail to come away with the firm impression that few, if any, House Members fully understand the implications of this far-reaching bill.

For example, Representative Celler, Democrat, of New York, one of the bill's sponsors, was asked whether it gives the right to sue members of a State legislature for damages for acts done in the exercise of their sworn duty. Mr. Celler wasn't sure. "That is a difficult question to answer," he said, "but I am inclined to believe it would not."

There were many questions, and no satisfactory answers, about a provision which gives the Attorney General authority to intervene when someone is "about to engage in an act" which might curtail a civil right. Representative TUMULTY, Democrat, of New Jersey, a civil-rights supporter, was disturbed by this and wanted to know what it meant. Representative FULTON, Republican, of Pennsylvania, answered him with this question: "Which part of the Democratic Party or what Democratic Party are you representing?"

Perhaps the most appropriate exchange came between Mr. Celler and Representative DRES of Texas. Mr. DRES had been asking some needling questions designed to focus attention on what he regarded as flaws in the bill. This reminded Mr. Celler of an exchange between Alice and Humpty Dumpty in which Alice asked: "How can you make words mean so many different things?" To which Mr. DRES responded: "Did Alice write this bill?"

It is our understanding that the Attorney General wrote the bill. But maybe Alice, or Humpty Dumpty, had a hand in it. At any rate its words mean, or could mean, so many different things that we think it ought to undergo careful, thorough, and searching study before it ever becomes law.

Miss Universe Contest at Long Beach Promotes World Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, this evening, at Long Beach, Calif., part of California's 18th Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, Miss Universe for 1956 will be chosen from comely contestants from many lands of the free world. The annual Miss Universe contest, sponsored wholly by individuals and businesses in the southern California area, is much more than a mere beauty pageant. Free nations throughout the world select and send their fairest representatives to a free America for this important event. Except for the chambers of the United Nations, probably no spot in the world concentrates so many nationalities together for a common purpose. By this means a greater understanding and a more peaceful intention flows between their countries.

These thoughts have been expressed more adequately than I am able to do in the following article by Spencer Crump appearing recently in the Southland magazine of the Independent-Press Telegram newspaper:

U. N. OF BEAUTY POWERFUL WEAPON FOR PEACE
(By Spencer Crump)

One of the world's greatest forces in the struggle for world peace, religious understanding and betterment of woman's position is in session here in Long Beach.

The Miss Universe beauties are damsels who would provoke an admiring whistle in any language.

But the Miss "U" girls are more than beauties, as their charms break down the barriers of international boundaries, language variations, differences in religion, and distances between continents.

As the beauties meet for the Universe festivities during the coming week, new understandings will develop between the girls for them to carry back to those at home.

These girls, as the stars of the fifth—and biggest yet—Miss Universe Pageant will be joining in a United Nations of Beauty.

As in past years, the spectacle of the world's most beautiful girls will be implemented by such inspiring and dramatic events as:

Miss France and Miss Germany, whose nations 3 times in 75 years warred, helping each other primp before parading before the judges.

A beauty of Greek Orthodox faith, an attractive Roman Catholic girl from Italy, and a charming Protestant contestant from Sweden forgetting differences in their interpretation of Christianity to help each other adjust ribbons before posing for photographers.

A curvaceous beauty from humid Panama and a sparkling damsel from cool Iceland finding that variations in climate mean nothing when it comes to holding mirrors as they adjust coiffures just before parade time.

An Austrian beauty demonstrating the fine points of her native waltz as a Brazilian contestant proudly shows the intricacies of her nation's rumba.

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

EXAMPLE OF CIA

I regard the Central Intelligence Agency's campaign to build its new headquarters at Langley, Va., and relocate all personnel there, as one outstanding example of the inadequacy and political aspects of present dispersal methods.

This move is being proposed against the advice of a large number of official planners, and of qualified, disinterested planning and economic consultants outside the planning agencies. It is occurring over what the New York Times terms "the vehement protests of—Langley—area property owners." From any logical viewpoint, involving the city's welfare and considerations of reasonable cost, CIA's move appears totally unjustifiable. Yet it has been allowed to progress to the final appropriations stage.

I do not have time here to outline the step-by-step development of this relocation project. But I would like to mention several facts in passing.

From the very start, the project was opposed by leading planners and consultants on the grounds of inadequacy of facilities at Langley, and the "disastrous" effect the relocation move might have on land use plans and community relationships.

In a study of possible CIA sites made by the two planning agencies at the request of CIA officials, more than 40 sites were included—but the planners did not even rank Langley in the first 20 possibilities.

At least two District sites were considered far superior to Langley by the planning agencies, but apparently neither ever received serious consideration by CIA officials.

One major consideration in CIA Director Allen Dulles' decision to relocate, according to some reports, has been his desire to provide his employees with a "Princeton type" campus atmosphere.

However, the most interesting fact of all concerns the manner in which final approval for the Langley site was obtained from the National Capital Planning Commission, chief planning agency for the District. The Commission's membership is made up of 12 persons—5 appointed by the White House, and 7 serving ex officio due to legislative or governmental positions.

In December of last year, Commission members disapproved the Langley site by a vote of 6 to 5. Soon after, two governmental employees serving on the Commission were replaced by two other individuals. One of those replaced was Fred S. Poorman, Deputy Public Buildings Administrator, who had abstained from voting. The other was Leon Zach, representing the Chief of Engineers. Mr. Zach had voted against Langley.

By a strange coincidence, immediately after these men were replaced, CIA requested a reconsideration of its proposal to relocate at Langley. At the next meeting of the Planning Commission, when the reconsideration took place, the two new men supported the site. Those were the only two votes that changed. The Commission was put on record as approving the site, by a vote of 7 to 5.

You can find these facts documented in the printed record of hearings held June 1 before the House Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations, in connection with CIA's request for additional appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I believe you will agree that the entire manner in which CIA's relocation request has been handled, points up the urgent need for an airtight procedure free of politics and personal whims.

Fortunately, responsible leaders in Washington are already alerted to this need. The alarm was sounded months ago by the Federal City Council, when it spearheaded a factfinding drive to develop better relocation procedure. In June the District Bankers Association added its support to this campaign by adopting a resolution expressing "deep concern" over present relocation methods, and pledging "unstinting cooperation until a logical and orderly procedure for Federal agency relocation is finally secured."

Both of the city's planning agencies have launched studies with a view to coming up with specific recommendations for improved relocation procedure.

RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

However, we cannot shirk the fact that prime responsibility for study and adoption of a better procedure rests with Congress. In Washington, as the editors of U. S. News & World Report have observed:

All fingers point to Congress. All the big decisions on affairs of the District of Columbia have to be made by District committees of the Senate and House, followed by action on the floor—just like any national law.

It was in recognition of our responsibilities in connection with Federal agency dispersal that I introduced House Joint Resolution 690 on July 17. This joint resolution sets forth Congress intent to preserve the District of Columbia as the seat of government as provided in article I of the Constitution. It calls for establishment of a basic policy for location of new Federal buildings as one means of implementing this intent.

Under the resolution, no funds appropriated before or after the date of its enactment shall be obligated or spent for construction of any building space for any agency of the Federal Government at any location outside the District of Columbia, but within 20 miles of the zero milestone, without express approval of Congress with respect to the proposed site for such construction.

By immediately adopting this resolution Congress can establish a policy and formally recognize its own decisive authority on relocation. I hope this will be done before the current session ends.

NEED FOR STUDY

However, I believe this resolution should be followed by a full-fledged study of present relocation methods, with a view to presenting specific recommendations to the next session of Congress. These proposals would outline further improvements which should be made in methods of relocating Federal agencies.

This study should take due cognizance of the new plan developed by General Services Administration for location of public buildings within the District and its environs. In accordance with GSA's proposed program, the National Capital Planning Commission is currently working to establish a floor for Federal employment in Washington—a minimum level below which population should not be depleted by Federal relocation.

The study which I am now proposing would go beyond these efforts with specific recommendations designed to:

First. Establish a standard operating procedure on relocation with adequate authority to see it is followed.

Second. Guarantee that planning agencies have sufficient time to study civic and economic effects of each proposed move.

Third. Insure that all agency officials are fully informed on relocation procedure.

Fourth. Give widest possible publicity to issues and problems involved in each agency relocation.

I hope this study will be launched before the current session ends. Until it is, the all-important matter of relocation of Federal agencies—to which the very future of our Nation's Capital is tied so closely—will continue to be decided on a basis of politics and personal whim, rather than on sound engineering and economic principles, as these relate to preservation of the Capital City.

In conclusion I would like to read the text of my House Joint Resolution 690:

Joint resolution to preserve the economic basis of the Nation's Capital by establishing a basic policy and an orderly procedure for the location of new Federal buildings in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia

Whereas Congress finds that there is a growing tendency on the part of Federal agencies to seek new locations in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, considering only the desires of the particular agency and without regard to the interests of the Government as a whole or the cumulative effect which such moves will have on the District of Columbia; and

Whereas it is the intention of the Congress to preserve the District of Columbia as the seat of Government as provided in article I of the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That it is declared to be the policy of the Congress that the development of the National Capital region shall be based upon the general concept that the District of Columbia shall be the seat of Government and that agencies which can be accommodated in the District of Columbia should be located there.

SEC. 2. All those responsible for the planning or construction of building space to accommodate agencies of the Federal Government within the greater metropolitan area of Washington shall be guided by the policy stated in the first section of this joint resolution.

SEC. 3. No funds appropriated before or after the date of enactment of this joint resolution shall be obligated or spent for the construction of any building space for any agency of the Federal Government at any location outside the District of Columbia, but within 20 miles of the zero milestone, without the express approval of the Congress with respect to the proposed site for such construction.

A5724

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 20

Address Delivered by Francis E. Walter,
Representative in Congress, 15th Dis-
trict, Pennsylvania, at the 38th Annual
Convention of the American Legion,
Department of Pennsylvania, Con-
vention Hall, Philadelphia, Pa., on July 20,
1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under
leave to extend my remarks in the Rec-
ord, I include the following address:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY FRANCES E. WALTER,
REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS, 15TH DIS-
TRICT, PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE 38TH ANNUAL
CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DE-
PARTMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA, CONVENTION
HALL, PHILADELPHIA, ON JULY 20, 1956

I would like to take the opportunity offered
by this great occasion to talk to you about
a matter of great importance, which is now
before the Congress.

Even at this very late hour when every-
body in Washington seems to be eager to
see the Congress adjourn and go home in
order to do some work on mending of politi-
cal fences, I sincerely hope that the legis-
lation I wish to discuss with you today will
be enacted into law before we go to Chicago
and to San Francisco, as the case may be,
to nominate presidential candidates.

The thing I have in mind is a bill which
I have introduced in order to restore good
sense to the laws governing the United States
Government's power to dismiss civilian em-
ployees when their employment is deemed to
be detrimental to the interests of the na-
tional security of this Nation.

The purpose of my bill is to protect the
United States Government from foreign in-
filtration by Communist agents through the
hole opened by the Supreme Court of the
United States. Also, it would serve to re-
mind the Supreme Court of the United States
of the place it occupies in the Government
of this Nation and of the impropriety to de-
velop a strange forgetfulness of the wording
of articles I, II, and III of the Constitution
of the United States.

Realizing the clear and present danger
which the international Communist con-
spiracy and its methods of penetration pre-
sent to the United States, the Congress en-
acted, in 1950, a law designed to protect the
United States Government from infiltration
of disloyal employees. The President has
implemented that law in an Executive order
and as you well know, the so-called secu-
rity and loyalty program as it affected em-
ployees of the United States Government has,
since its inception, been under a constant
and sharp attack by the Communists, their
allies, and their dupes.

One rather enterprising employee of the
Department of Health, Education, and Wel-
fare by the name of Kendrick M. Cole has
agreed to become the tool of those who want
to wreck this program, and after having been
dismissed from Federal employment because
of his questionable activities and associa-
tions he has taken his case to the courts.

He was turned down by a Federal district
court and by a Federal court of appeals.
He went to the Supreme Court of the United
States and there he won a victory which
represents one of the most stunning defeats
for the United States Government.

A divided Supreme Court of the United
States, with 6 Justices in the majority and

3 dissenting—Justices Clark, Reed, and Min-
ton—has invaded the powers of the Congress
and of the President of the United States
and has mutilated the law of 1950 and the
President's Executive Order No. 10450 of 1953.
This unconstitutional action of the judiciary
branch took the form of a decision (*Cole v.
Young*), which, in effect, amends the law by
adding to it just four words. Four words
which, in limiting the scope of the law, open
the entire United States Government to the
infiltration of our mortal enemies.

In plain words, the law—the act of August
26, 1950—is applicable to “any civilian offi-
cer, or employee” of the United States. What
it meant was simply that every civilian offi-
cer and employee who has the privilege of
being employed by the United States Govern-
ment must be without a peradventure of
doubt loyal to the United States and not as-
sociated with any subversive organization.

To the words “any civilian officer, or em-
ployee” the Supreme Court has added four
words, “in a sensitive position,” thus pro-
viding that out of the 2,300,000 civilians who
hold Government jobs, only one-fifth must
be loyal Americans and the remaining four-
fifths could keep their Federal jobs although
their loyalty to the United States is ques-
tionable and although they may remain un-
der Communist discipline.

Obviously, such preposterous thought
never occurred to the Congress and it never
occurred to the President of the United
States that such was the intent of Congress
in enacting the 1950 law.

The legislative history of that law is ex-
ceptionally clear, as legislative histories go.
Reports filed by committee of the Senate and
of the House of Representatives, and the de-
bate held on the floors of both Houses of
Congress, prove without a scintilla of doubt
that the law was meant to apply to every
executive agency, not only to the “sensitive”
ones—and to every Federal employee, not
only to those who hold “sensitive” positions.

No Member of the House and no Member
of the Senate contradicted when those state-
ments were made. In fact, no contradiction
could have been voiced for there probably
is no one in the Congress who believes that
there is in the entire Federal Government
one job which could be offered to a person
whose loyalty to the United States is doubt-
ful.

As Justice Clark—with whom Justices
Reed and Minton joined—stated in his dis-
senting opinion, “the janitor may prove to
be in as important a spot security-wise as
the top employee in the building.”

But let's not stop at janitors—look at the
Tennessee Valley Authority. TVA supplies
power for the most important of our atomic
plants. An electrician in a TVA power plant
is not classified as a “sensitive” employee.
He certainly could not be so classified under
the Supreme Court's ruling, and yet look at
the extent of damage to our security that he
could do. Think of the staggering blow that
could be dealt to our atomic work if that
electrician would simply throw a switch to
cut off the power at a moment chosen by
those under whose discipline he remains.

As a matter of fact, think of what a char-
woman could find in an office that she is
hired to clean after everybody else had left.
And think about the nonsensitive file clerk
who moves freely around offices where
highly classified documents are stored.

The Supreme Court of the United States
said in *Cole v. Young*, leaning over back-
ward in order to misread and misinterpret
congressional and presidential intent that all
that was intended is to protect from sub-
versive infiltration only those activities of
the Government that are directly concerned
with the protection of the Nation, and not
those which contribute to the strength of
the Nation “only through their impact on the
general welfare.” It clearly follows that the
Supreme Court of the United States would
not mind at all if agencies or parts of them,

such as the services protecting the Nation's
health and welfare, the education of our
youth, agencies in charge of interstate and
foreign commerce, mailing rooms, archives,
certain communication rooms, etc., would
become “honeycombed with subversives,” if
I may quote once more Justice Clark.

If we permit the decision of the Supreme
Court of the United States to stand, we would
simply open what Mr. Churchill so aptly
called our “soft underbelly” to agents of the
Communist conspiracy, who from that soft
spot, skillfully worming their way upward,
could easily reach the very nerve center of the
Nation. In addition to that, if we do nothing
about this decision, we would condone the
Supreme Court's attempt to invade that area
of Government which, under the Constitu-
tion, is reserved to the Congress and the
President.

The 3 dissenting Justices were quite
outspoken in that regard, actually accusing
their 6 colleagues responsible for the *Cole*
decision of raising a question as to the con-
stitutional power of the President to au-
thorize dismissal of executive employees
whose further employment he believes to be
inconsistent with national security.

In reading the Supreme Court's decision in
the *Cole* case, I cannot help but feel that I
was right several months ago when in read-
ing another of our Supreme Court's decision,
I felt that the illustrious Justices dwell in
ivory towers with windows shut tight and
shutters drawn, carefully looking away from
the mortal danger facing our freedom—the
freedom which our laws are designed to pro-
tect and not to help destroy.

There is something uncanny in the stub-
bornness of some of our courts, including the
Supreme Bench, with which they refuse to
appraise properly the true meaning of the
new skin that the Soviet leopard has now
clothed itself. They refuse to see the same
old spots on the leopard's skin, thus aiding
and abetting the Soviet's effort to confuse
and disarm the free world by stressing their
peaceful intentions while intensifying their
attempt to conquer through infiltration
rather than through an open attack. It
could be that the Supreme Court is not afraid
of the danger of Soviet infiltration through
actions of the Communist conspiracy because
some of our Justices have shortsightedly
accepted the opinion of the Fund for the
Republic, the opinion which maintains that
the Communist Party is nothing else but a
political party of the United States just as
is the Democratic Party or the Republican
Party. That opinion was clearly and un-
equivocally stated in the report of the Fund
for the Republic, dated May 31, 1955, a report
for which Mr. Robert M. Hutchins, the fund's
president, must accept responsibility.

In spite of congressional findings made in
two legislative enactments, the Internal Se-
curity Act of 1950 and the Communist Con-
trol Act of 1954, where on the basis of ir-
refutable proof it was found that “the Com-
munist Party of the United States, although
purportedly a political party, is in fact an
instrumentality of a conspiracy to overthrow
the Government of the United States”—Mr.
Hutchins and his research specialists arrived
at the opposite conclusion.

What the Congress found is, of course, of
little interest to the Fund for the Republic
and I wish therefore to invite their atten-
tion to a most recent pronouncement coming
from a source to which they might want to
give more credence. I have in mind a major
pronouncement printed in the official organ
of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union,
Pravda, just a few days ago, on July 16, 1956.

On that day, *Pravda* sounded a warning to
the free world in general and to the United
States in particular. Said *Pravda*:

“One should remember that among people
who are insufficiently mature politically and
excessively credulous, there may be some
who would fall for the contention that in-
ternational connections of Communist par-

84TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. J. RES. 690

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 17, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey introduced the following joint resolution; which
was referred to the Committee on Public Works

JOINT RESOLUTION

To preserve the economic basis of the Nation's Capital by
establishing a basic policy and an orderly procedure for the
location of new Federal buildings in the metropolitan area
of the District of Columbia.

Whereas Congress finds that there is a growing tendency on the
part of Federal agencies to seek new locations in the vicinity
of the District of Columbia, considering only the desires of
the particular agency and without regard to the interests of
the Government as a whole or the cumulative effect which
such moves will have on the District of Columbia; and

Whereas it is the intention of the Congress to preserve the Dis-
trict of Columbia as the seat of Government as provided in
article I of the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

I

1 That it is declared to be the policy of the Congress that the
2 development of the National Capital region shall be based
3 upon the general concept that the District of Columbia shall
4 be the seat of government and that agencies which can be
5 accommodated in the District of Columbia should be located
6 there.

7 SEC. 2. All those responsible for the planning or con-
8 struction of building space to accommodate agencies of the
9 Federal Government within the greater metropolitan area
10 of Washington shall be guided by the policy stated in the
11 first section of this joint resolution.

12 SEC. 3. No funds appropriated before or after the date
13 of enactment of this joint resolution shall be obligated or
14 spent for the construction of any building space for any
15 agency of the Federal Government at any location outside
16 the District of Columbia, but within twenty miles of the
17 zero milestone, without the express approval of the Congress
18 with respect to the proposed site for such construction.

84TH CONGRESS
2d Session

H. J. RES. 690

JOINT RESOLUTION

To preserve the economic basis of the Nation's Capital by establishing a basic policy and an orderly procedure for the location of new Federal buildings in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey

JULY 17, 1956

Referred to the Committee on Public Works

House of Representatives, U.S.
PUBLIC DOCUMENT
FREE

Frank Thompson, Jr.
M. C.

Honorable Allen W. Dulles

Respectfully referred for your
comment and suggestions.

NEW JERSEY.